

ORIGINAL

ANN BAVENDER\*  
ANNE GOODWIN CRUMP\*  
VINCENT J. CURTIS, JR.  
RICHARD J. ESTEVEZ  
PAUL J. FELDMAN  
ERIC FISHMAN  
RICHARD HILDRETH  
FRANK R. JAZZO  
ANDREW S. KERSTING\*  
EUGENE M. LAWSON, JR.  
HARRY C. MARTIN  
J. TODD METCALF\*  
GEORGE PETRUTSAS  
LEONARD R. RAISH  
JAMES P. RILEY  
KATHLEEN VICTORY  
HOWARD M. WEISS

\* NOT ADMITTED IN VIRGINIA

FLETCHER, HEALD & HILDRETH, P.L.C.

ATTORNEYS AT LAW

11th FLOOR, 1300 NORTH 17th STREET

ROSSLYN, VIRGINIA 22209-3801

(703) 812-0400

TELECOPIER

(703) 812-0486

INTERNET

office@fhh-telcomlaw.com

FRANK U. FLETCHER  
(1939-1985)  
ROBERT L. HEALD  
(1956-1983)  
PAUL D.P. SPEARMAN  
(1936-1982)  
FRANK ROBERSON  
(1937-1981)  
RUSSELL ROWELL  
(1948-1977)

RETIRED  
EDWARD F. KENEHAN

CONSULTANT FOR INTERNATIONAL AND  
INTERGOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS  
SHELDON J. KRYS  
U. S. AMBASSADOR (ret.)

OF COUNSEL  
EDWARD A. CAINE\*  
JOHN JOSEPH SMITH\*  
MITCHELL LAZARUS\*

WRITER'S DIRECT

LOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

97-249  
97-250

December 29, 1997

703-812-0403

RECEIVED

DEC 29 1997

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

**VIA HAND DELIVERY**

Magalie Salas, Esq.

Secretary

Federal Communications Commission

1919 M Street, N.W., Room 222


Washington, DC 20054

Re: Access Reform Tariff Filings  
Reply of Roseville Telephone Company to Petition of AT&T Corp.

Dear Ms. Salas:

On behalf of Roseville Telephone Company ("RTC"), enclosed is an original and three copies of its "Reply to the Petition of AT&T Corp. on Rate of Return LEC Tariff Filings", filed December 23, 1997. If there are any questions regarding this matter, please contact me.

Very truly yours,



Paul J. Feldman

Counsel to

Roseville Telephone Company

PJF/jr

Enclosures

cc: Certificate of Service



the basis for this requirement. However, a review of the language of that paragraph does not provide the authority asserted by AT&T. The requirements established in that paragraph are designed to "ensure that these transmission costs will be recovered from those using transmission facilities ..." (emphasis added). In response that paragraph, RTC reassigned central office transmission equipment costs, but did not consider cable & Wire facilities to be "transmission facilities", and accordingly did not remove the cost of those facilities associated with host/remote trunking costs. RTC believes that its interpretation of the language of Paragraph 220 is correct, and AT&T has made no showing demonstrating that cable & wire facilities are reasonably included in the category of transmission facilities. Accordingly, the portion of the Petition alleging that RTC did not properly reallocate host/remote trunking costs should be denied.

If the Bureau concludes, however, that costs associated with Cable & Wire Facilities should have been removed, RTC will correct this allocation and refile as ordered by the Bureau. It should be noted however, that the host/remote trunking costs associated with Cable & Wire Facilities is not the \$140,000 stated by AT&T. RTC has recalculated its interstate revenue requirement for TST on the assumption that costs from Cable & Wire Facilities should be removed, and the result would be an increase of \$170,473, of which 46.67 percent is assigned to the tandem switching rate element, with the remainder assigned to the TIC until completion of the subsequent two steps of the tandem switching cost transfer. Therefore, if there has been an overstatement of the TIC, the amount of such overstatement would be **\$79,560**.

B. *RTC Inadvertently Did Not Remove  
Tandem Trunk Port Costs From the TIC.*

RTC acknowledges that it did not remove trunk port costs associated with the tandem switching investment from the TIC. This inadvertent error resulted from RTC's belief (set forth for example in paragraph 174 of the Access Reform First Report and Order) that the requirement to do so was imposed only on price-cap carriers.

RTC estimates that the trunk port costs at issue are \$73,853, of which 46.67 percent are to be assigned to tandem switching, with the remainder to be included in the TIC until the completion of the three-part tandem switching cost transfer.

WHEREFORE, Roseville Telephone Company requests that the portion of AT&T's Petition asserting that RTC improperly failed to remove host/remote trunking costs associated with Cable & Wire Facilities be denied.

Respectfully submitted,

ROSEVILLE TELEPHONE COMPANY

By:   
George Petrutsas  
Paul J. Feldman

Its Attorneys

FLETCHER, HEALD & HILDRETH, PLC  
1300 North Seventeenth Street  
11th Floor  
Rosslyn, Virginia 22209  
(703) 812-0400

December 29, 1997

## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Judy Ryan, a secretary in the law firm of Fletcher, Heald & Hildreth, P.L.C., hereby certify that true copies of the foregoing Reply to Petition of AT&T Corp. were served this 29th day of December, 1997, upon:

### Via Hand Delivery

Mr. Richard A. Metzger, Jr.  
Chief, Common Carrier Bureau  
Federal Communications Commission  
1919 M Street, N.W., Room 500  
Washington, DC 20554

James D. Schlichting, Esq.  
Chief, Competitive Pricing Division  
Federal Communications Commission  
1919 M Street, N.W., Room 518  
Washington, DC 20554

Judith A. Nitsche, Esq.  
Chief, Tariff and Price Analysis Branch  
Federal Communications Commission  
Common Carrier Bureau  
1919 M Street, N.W., Room 518  
Washington, DC 20554

Mr. John Scott  
Common Carrier Bureau  
Federal Communications Commission  
1919 M Street, N.W., Room 518  
Washington, DC 20554

Mr. R. L. Smith  
Common Carrier Bureau  
Federal Communications Commission  
1919 M Street, N.W., Room 518  
Washington, DC 20554

International Transcription Service  
1919 M Street, N.W., Room 246  
Washington, DC 20554

### Via Telefax (908-953-6788)

Ms. Yolanda Brooks  
AT&T Corp.  
295 North Maple Avenue  
Basking Ridge, NJ 07920

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Judy Ryan